

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,873	09/22/2003	Hideo Tamamura	03560.003356 4235	
5514 FITZPATRICE	7590 12/20/2007 K CELLA HARPER & SCI	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			HODGE, ROBERT W	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summer	10/664,873	TAMAMURA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Robert Hodge	1795		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 No.</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Identified or b) objected to by the Identified or by the Ident	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

10/664,873 Art Unit: 1795

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants state that Bullock does not teach a "detector" and do not agree with Examiner Yuan's broad interpretation of the claimed recitation and further state that the display and controller relied on to meet the limitation of a "detector" is clearly not part of the fuel supply apparatus of Bullock and direct the Examiner to Figs 2 and 3. This is not found persuasive for at least the reason that there is no specific structure defined in the claims for the detector. Therefore Examiner Yuan's interpretation is a very reasonable interpretation of the recitation of a detector given its broadest most reasonable definition. With regards to the allegation that Bullock does not teach that the display and controller cannot be a detector because they are not part of the fuel supply apparatus they are part of the device to which the fuel is supplied and refer the Examiner to figures 2 and 3. However this is not found persuasive because it is clear from figure 2 alone that the fuel supply apparatus (i.e. cartridge) is in fact connected to the system control and display through the system control, which means that the fuel cartridge requires the presence of the system control and vice versa. As was stated above there is no specific structure defined in claim 8 specifically reciting what structure must be present for a detector and therefore due to the breadth of the claim as well as the use of open claim language Bullock reads on claim 8 as recited. Therefore the rejection will be maintained.

10/664,873 Art Unit: 1795

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (US 6,713,201 B2) in view of Dunstan (US 2003/0096144 A1).

Bullock et al. teach a fuel cell system comprising a fuel cell stack (128) and a fuel supply apparatus (132), wherein the access to the fuel supply unit and the waterdischarging unit is disposed at the same face of the fuel cell and the fuel supply apparatus comprising a fuel supply unit (142) and a water-suctioning unit (144) (vacuum). Bullock et al. further teach the header information stored by the information storage device will be accessed by the system controller after the PDA has been initiated (e.g., powered up or reset) with a fuel cartridge present within the fuel cell housing socket. The data structure parameter will be accessed prior to the keying information. In the instance where the keying information stored on the information storage device indicates that the fuel cartridge corresponds to the requirements of the host device, operating will be permitted. If, on the other hand, the keying information indicates that the fuel cartridge is wholly unacceptable, fuel transfer/cell operation will be prevented and the user will receive an audible and/or visibly message concerning the situation. Also, the fuel cell stack (128) is connected to various electrical loads such as the display (114) and system controller (126). The absence of the fuel cell stack from the device will necessarily be detected by the display and controller due to lack of

Art Unit: 1795

power. See Figure 3, Column 3, Line 45 to Column 4, Lines 34, Column 6, Line 57 to Column 7, Line 12.

Bullock et al. do not teach or suggest the water-suctioning unit includes an evaporator that provides heat to the suctioned water.

Dunstan teaches a system to remove heat and water from a fuel cell-powered portable electronic device. The system comprises a water- absorbing material and a heat-generating device (16) that facilitates the evaporation of the water byproduct. See Paragraphs 19,25, Figures 1a-1c.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a heat-generating device in the fuel cell system of Bullock et al., as taught by Dunstan in order to facilitate the evaporation of byproduct water collected in the system.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

10/664,873

Art Unit: 1795

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Hodge whose telephone number is (571) 272-2097. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RWH

JONATHAN CREPEAU PRIMARY EXAMINER